

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph Tyrone Evans,)	C/A No. 3:06-2486-RBH-JRM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
Lexington County Detention Center; and)	Report and Recommendation
James R. Metts, Ed.D.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

The plaintiff, Joseph Tyrone Evans (Plaintiff), proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.¹ Plaintiff is an inmate at the Lexington County Detention Center, and files this action *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The complaint names as defendants the Lexington County Detention Center and James R. Metts (Sheriff). Plaintiff seeks monetary damages for allegedly contracting scabies and a staph infection at the Lexington County Detention Center. Plaintiff claims to have exhausted his administrative remedies in compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). The complaint should be dismissed for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: Denton

¹ Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the undersigned is authorized to review such complaints for relief and submit findings and recommendations to the District Court.

v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr., 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995) (*en banc*), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 1177 (1996); Todd v. Baskerville, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

The complaint herein has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” § 1915(e)(2)(B)(I), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. at 31. Hence, under § 1915(e)(2)(B), a claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte*. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); Allison v. Kyle, 66 F.3d 71 (5th Cir. 1995).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, Hughes v. Rowe, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980) (*per curiam*). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so, but a district court may not rewrite a petition to include claims that were never presented, Barnett v. Hargett, 174 F.3d 1128, 1133 (10th Cir. 1999), or construct the plaintiff's legal arguments for him, Small v. Endicott, 998 F.2d 411, 417-18 (7th Cir. 1993), or “conjure up

questions never squarely presented” to the court, Beaudett v. City of Hampton, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 475 U.S. 1088 (1986). The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. Weller v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs., 901 F.2d 387, (4th Cir. 1990).

Background

Plaintiff’s complaint alleges that, on or about February 17, 2006, he was injured by being in an unsafe environment where he contracted scabies and a staph infection. Plaintiff states he has been in pain and has sores and permanent scars all over his body. Plaintiff indicates he has been seen by a doctor for his medical condition. Plaintiff requests \$850,000.00 in damages.

Discussion

The first defendant listed in the plaintiff’s complaint is the Lexington County Detention Center. In order to state a claim for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, an aggrieved party must sufficiently allege that he or she was injured by “the deprivation of any [of his] rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the [United States] Constitution and laws” by a “person” acting “under color of state law.” See 42 U.S.C. § 1983; Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 691 (1978). It is well settled that only “persons” may act under color of state law, therefore, a defendant in a section 1983 action must qualify as a “person.” The Lexington County Detention Center is a facility used to house prisoners and detainees. Inanimate objects such as buildings, facilities, and grounds cannot act under color of state law. Hence, the Lexington County Detention Center is not a “person” subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See Allison v. California Adult Auth.,

419 F.2d 822, 823 (9th Cir. 1969)(California Adult Authority and San Quentin Prison not "person[s]" subject to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); Preval v. Reno, 57 F.Supp.2d 307, 310 (E.D. Va. 1999), *overruled on other grounds*, Preval v. Reno, 203 F.3d 821 (4th Cir. 2000)("[T]he Piedmont Regional Jail is not a 'person,' and therefore not amenable to suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983."); Brooks v. Pembroke City Jail, 722 F. Supp. 1294, 1301(E.D. N.C. 1989)("Claims under § 1983 are directed at 'persons' and the jail is not a person amenable to suit."). Since the Lexington County Detention Center is not a "person", it should be removed as a defendant in this case.

The plaintiff also lists James R. Metts as a defendant in the lawsuit. James R. Metts is the Sheriff of Lexington County and, according to plaintiff's complaint, in charge of the Lexington County Detention Center. Plaintiff's complaint does not indicate whether the lawsuit is against defendant Metts in his individual or official capacity, however, defendant Metts is entitled to summary dismissal in either instance.

In South Carolina a sheriff, and his deputies, are state actors. See Cone v. Nettles, 308 S.C. 109, 112, 417 S.E.2d 523, 524-25 (1992) (citing reasoning of Gulledge v. Smart, 691 F. Supp. 947 (D.S.C. 1988), *aff'd*, 878 F.2d 379 (1989)). A suit against them in federal court in their official capacities is therefore barred by the eleventh amendment. McConnell v. Adams, 829 F.2d 1319, 1328- 29 (4th Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 486 U.S. 1006 (1988). See *also* Cromer v. Brown, 88 F.3d 1315, 1332 (4th Cir. 1996) (finding sheriff to be immune because, in his official capacity, he is "an arm of the state"); McCall v. Williams, 52 F. Supp. 2d 611, 615 (D.S.C. 1999) (same). Therefore, defendant Metts is not liable under § 1983 in his official capacity.

In regards to individual liability, supervisory officials may be held liable, in certain

circumstances, for constitutional injuries inflicted by their subordinates. Shaw v. Stroud, 13 F.3d 701, 798 (4th Cir. 1994). However, certain criteria must be met before such liability can attach. The plaintiff must show that the supervisory official was (1) actually or constructively aware of a risk of constitutional injury, (2) deliberately indifferent to that risk, and (3) that an affirmative causal link exists between the supervisor's inaction and the particular constitutional injury suffered by the plaintiff. Carter v. Morris, 164 F.3d 215, 221. Plaintiff's complaint contains no facts regarding defendant Metts which would satisfy the above criteria. Therefore, defendant Metts is not liable in his individual capacity and the complaint against him should be dismissed.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance of service of process. See Todd v. Baskerville 712 F.2d at 74, Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. at 31, Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. at 324-25. Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/Joseph R. McCrorey
United States Magistrate Judge

September 22, 2006
Columbia, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Magistrate Judge's "Report and Recommendation"
&
The Serious Consequences of a Failure to Do So

The parties are hereby notified that any objections to the attached Report and Recommendation (or Order and Recommendation) must be filed within **ten (10) days** of the date of service. 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. A magistrate judge makes only a recommendation, and the authority to make a final determination in this case rests with the United States District Judge. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-271 (1976); and Estrada v. Witkowski, 816 F. Supp. 408, 410 (D.S.C. 1993).

During the period for filing objections, but not thereafter, a party must file with the Clerk of Court specific, written objections to the Report and Recommendation, if he or she wishes the United States District Judge to consider any objections. **Any written objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.** See Keeler v. Pea, 782 F. Supp. 42, 43-44 (D.S.C. 1992); and Oliveron v. West Valley City, 875 F. Supp. 1465, 1467 (D.Utah 1995). Failure to file specific, written objections shall constitute a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the United States District Judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n. 4 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, Schronce v. United States, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984); and Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-847 & nn. 1-3 (4th Cir. 1985). Moreover, if a party files specific objections to a portion of a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, but does not file specific objections to other portions of the Report and Recommendation, that party waives appellate review of the portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation to which he or she did not object. In other words, a party's failure to object to one issue in a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation precludes that party from subsequently raising that issue on appeal, even if objections are filed on other issues. Howard v. Secretary of HHS, 932 F.2d 505, 508-509 (6th Cir. 1991). See also Praylow v. Martin, 761 F.2d 179, 180 n. 1 (4th Cir.) (party precluded from raising on appeal factual issue to which it did not object in the district court), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1009 (1985). In Howard, *supra*, the Court stated that general, non-specific objections are *not* sufficient:

A general objection to the entirety of the [magistrate judge's] report has the same effects as would a failure to object. The district court's attention is not focused on any specific issues for review, thereby making the initial reference to the [magistrate judge] useless. * * * This duplication of time and effort wastes judicial resources rather than saving them, and runs contrary to the purposes of the Magistrates Act. * * * We would hardly countenance an appellant's brief simply objecting to the district court's determination without explaining the source of the error.

Accord Lockert v. Faulkner, 843 F.2d 1015, 1017-1019 (7th Cir. 1988), where the Court held that the appellant, who proceeded *pro se* in the district court, was barred from raising issues on appeal that he did not specifically raise in his objections to the district court:

Just as a complaint stating only 'I complain' states no claim, an objection stating only 'I object' preserves no issue for review. * * * A district judge should not have to guess what arguments an objecting party depends on when reviewing a [magistrate judge's] report.

See also Branch v. Martin, 886 F.2d 1043, 1046 (8th Cir. 1989) ("no de novo review if objections are untimely or general"), which involved a *pro se* litigant; and Goney v. Clark, 749 F.2d 5, 7 n. 1 (3rd Cir. 1984) ("plaintiff's objections lacked the specificity to trigger *de novo* review"). **This notice, hereby, apprises the parties of the consequences of a failure to file specific, written objections.** See Wright v. Collins, *supra*; and Small v. Secretary of HHS, 892 F.2d 15, 16 (2nd Cir. 1989). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections addressed as follows:

**Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
901 Richland Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201**